A STRUGGLE BETWEEN TWO LINES OVER THE QUESTION OF HOW TO DEAL WITH U.S. IMPERIALISM

FAN HSIU-CHU

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING

A STRUGGLE BETWEEN TWO LINES OVER THE QUESTION OF HOW TO DEAL WITH U.S. IMPERIALISM

FAN HSIU-CHU

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS
PEKING 1965

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This article was first published in the *Ta Kung Pao*, Peking, July 26, 1965.

Printed in the People's Republic of China

IMPORTANT differences of principle exist between contemporary Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists on the question of how to understand and deal with U.S. imperialism.

For several years now, Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninists throughout the world have engaged in public polemics on an unprecedented scale with the Khrushchov revisionists and waged sharp struggles against them. One of the major issues of the polemics is whether to unite with the people of the world to oppose U.S. imperialism and its lackeys or to unite with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys to oppose the people of the world.

The differences of principle on this question have come into existence since the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where Khrushchov revisionism made its first public appearance. From that time the CPSU leadership, headed by Khrushchov, has betrayed Marxism-Leninism. It has not scrupled to sell out the interests of the Soviet people, the people of the socialist camp and the people of the whole world in order to pursue its revisionist line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination". Moreover, it has taken every possible opportunity to accommodate and capitulate to U.S. imperialism. The Soviet and U.S. leaders have praised and increasingly collaborated with each other. They have joined in a love feast, creating a foul atmosphere. During the last few years, however, this revisionist line has met with ignominious bankruptcy after being thoroughly ex-

posed by Marxist-Leninists and resolutely opposed by the people throughout the world. It was not long before Khrushchov, who had stood briefly in the limelight as a "great personage", fell from the historical stage.

The followers of Khrushchovism-without-Khrushchov have taken over Khrushchov's trashy legacy. Realizing that things could not continue in Khrushchov's crude, bombastic and reckless manner, they have disguised themselves, put new labels on old wares and endeavoured to show that they are different from Khrushchov. They have used more cunning, softer tactics to deal with Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries, employed certain hypocritical anti-imperialist phraseology to deceive the people of the world and tried their utmost to worm their way into the people's revolutionary ranks, hoping to gain a breathing-space and make political capital. But there is in fact not an iota of difference between Khrushchov and these old partners of his in respect to the nature of their revisionism. No matter how many metamorphoses they may go through, they have not departed from their line; they are still pushing ahead with their modern revisionism, still hankering after "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination" and still uniting with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys to oppose the people of the world.

The struggle of the people of the world against U.S. imperialism has now entered a period of deepening intensity. The followers of Khrushchovism-without-Khrushchov are serving U.S. imperialism in a more stealthy and crafty way; they are more, and not less, dangerous than Khrushchov. In order to lead the struggle against U.S. imperialism to still greater victories, it is necessary to expose their dual tactics and their hypocritical features

and completely smash the Khrushchov revisionist line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination".

The differences of principle between Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists on the question of how to understand and deal with U.S. imperialism are mainly manifested in the following three facets:

1. How to understand the nature of U.S. imperialism.
2. How to estimate the strength of U.S. imperialism.
3. How to deal with U.S. imperialism.

HOW TO UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

Aggression and war is the nature of imperialism. This is true when imperialism makes headway and remains true when it suffers defeat. This is true when the revolutionary forces are weak and remains true when they are strong. In a word, the nature of imperialism never changes. Anyone who departs from this point of view is apt to harbour illusions about imperialism, waver in the anti-imperialist struggle and take the path of opportunism.

A MARXIST LAW

Just before the conclusion of World War I Lenin pointed out:

> . . . Imperialism, on the other hand, i.e., monopoly capitalism, which finally matured only in the twentieth century, is, by virtue of its fundamental economic traits, distinguished by a minimum fondness for peace and freedom, and by a maximum and universal development

of militarism. To "fail to notice" this in discussing the extent to which a peaceful or violent revolution is typical or probable is to stoop to the position of a most ordinary lackey of the bourgeoisie.[1]

During the period of relative stability of capitalism after World War I, Stalin said: "Imperialism cannot live without violence and robbery, without bloodshed and shooting. That is the nature of imperialism."[2]

After World War II when the Chinese people defeated the Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries, who were supported by U.S. imperialism, and won the great victory in their revolution, Comrade Mao Tse-tung said:

> . . . Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again . . . till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law. When we say "imperialism is ferocious", we mean that its nature will never change, that the imperialists will never lay down their butcher knives, that they will never become Buddhas, till their doom.[3]

The whole period since the appearance of imperialism has borne out the Marxist-Leninist truth that the nature

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky", *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 44-45.

[2] J. V. Stalin, "Speech Delivered at the Fifth All-Union Conference of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League", *Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. IX, p. 201.

[3] Mao Tse-tung, "Cast Away Illusions, Prepare for Struggle", *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 428.

of imperialism never changes. All the aggressive activities and war crimes perpetrated by U.S. imperialism, the leader of imperialism, since the end of World War II have further testified to this truth. Now this has been grasped by more and more people and has become a powerful ideological weapon for raising the political consciousness of the people and organizing their strength to combat U.S. imperialism.

In a class society man's class nature is his inherent character and quality. The nature of U.S. imperialism is the inherent character of the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie. Addressing the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in 1964, Lyndon B. Johnson admitted that the monopoly capitalists were stockholders of the U.S. government, who had hired him to serve them. This admission lays bare the class nature of the U.S. government.

U.S. imperialism attempts to build up a world empire on a scale hitherto unknown and to encroach on and dominate the vast intermediate zone between the socialist camp and the United States; it attempts to stamp out the revolutions of the oppressed nations and peoples and proceed to destroy the socialist countries, and thus to place all peoples and countries under the servitude and domination of the U.S. monopoly capital. This is the basic aim of the counter-revolutionary global strategy pursued by the successive U.S. administrations since the end of World War II, and it is also the concentrated expression of the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism.

In "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has quoted the correct conclusion contained in the 1960 Moscow State-

ment which points out that U.S. imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter, the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme, an enemy of the peoples of the whole world. This is a Marxist-Leninist scientific thesis.

THE MOST ORDINARY LACKEY OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

The Khrushchov revisionists, completely violating the Marxist-Leninist principle in regard to imperialism, violating the 1960 Moscow Statement which they signed, and ignoring the most obvious facts, stubbornly claim that because of the might of the socialist camp and the existence of nuclear weapons, the nature of U.S. imperialism has changed, the forces of aggression and war have changed into forces for "safeguarding peace", and the chieftains of U.S. imperialism have changed into a "reasonable group". According to them, man has only a natural attribute but no class attribute; the imperialists "also have heads on their shoulders, and brains"[1] and "do not want to start a war that will spell their own destruction".[2] According to them, nuclear weapons have changed the course of human history; "the atomic bomb does not draw class distinctions";[3] socialism should not wage a struggle against capitalism but should like it; "some don't

---

[1] N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at a Meeting of Soviet-Hungarian Friendship in Moscow on July 19, 1963, *Moscow News*, Supplement, No. 30, 1963.

[2] N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the Third Congress of the Rumanian Workers' Party on June 21, 1960, *New Times*, Supplement, No. 27, 1960.

[3] Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to All Party Organisations, to All Communists of the Soviet Union, *New Times*, Supplement, No. 29, 1963.

like Socialism, some dislike capitalism — we shall destroy our Noah's Ark, the globe".[1] According to them, the bourgeoisie can be changed into proletariat and monopoly capitalists can become Communists, and "when the Soviet people will enjoy the blessings of communism", even the capitalists will realize how ignorant and guilty they were when they opposed communism and they will then support socialism and "join the Communist Party". In what is said by the self-styled faithful pupils of Lenin, is there any trace of a Communist, any shadow of Marxism-Leninism? Aren't they exactly like the most ordinary lackeys of U.S. imperialism, as described by Lenin?

From Khrushchov to the Khrushchov-revisionists-without-Khrushchov, these men have persisted in their most absurd views, absolutely refusing to learn the object lessons. They embellish whoever assumes the U.S. presidency. When Eisenhower became president, they described him as a man who "has a sincere desire for peace", who "worries about ensuring peace". But when Eisenhower sent a U-2 plane to intrude into the Soviet Union, their dream of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation" was shattered. At that time Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out that "no unrealistic illusions should be cherished with regard to imperialism. Some people had described Eisenhower as a great lover of peace. I hope these people will be awakened by these facts".[2] The Khrushchov revisionists, however, have not woken up. When Kennedy took office, they lauded him to the skies, saying that he had "a broad

---

[1] N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the Austria-U.S.S.R. Society on July 2, 1960, *Moscow News*, July 6, 1960.

[2] *Chairman Mao Tse-tung's Important Talks with Guests from Asia, Africa and Latin America*, Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1965, p. 7.

vision", "a clear head" and "a reasonable attitude". But it was this same Kennedy who grabbed Khrushchov by the throat during the Carribean crisis and held him up to ridicule. When Kennedy was assassinated, Khrushchov and his like, past all sense of shame, tearfully and mournfully cried, "President Kennedy's death is a heavy blow to all who hold dear the cause of peace and Soviet-American co-operation."[1] They felt as if the whole world would stop when Kennedy went up to Heaven.

Proceeding from a pragmatic point of view, the Khrushchov revisionists even take different attitudes towards the leader of U.S. imperialism before and after he comes into power. Prior to Johnson's assumption of the U.S. presidency, they described him as one who "denies, in effect, the possibility of collaboration between the capitalist and socialist countries."[2] But when Johnson became president, they immediately expressed satisfaction. They were delighted when Johnson was re-elected last year, asserting that the Johnson Administration could be expected to "take concrete steps towards the further improvement of the world political climate"[3] and spreading the belief that "sufficiently broad areas for co-operation" existed between the Soviet Union and the United States.

To the Khrushchov revisionists, the aggressive U.S. imperialism no longer exists; what needs to be done is to bring about "mutual concessions", "mutual compromise", "mutual conciliation", and "mutual accommodation" with the United States. But the course of events runs com-

---

[1] N. S. Khrushchov, Message to Johnson, *New Times*, No. 48, 1963.

[2] "President Kennedy's Interview", *Izvestia*, December 4, 1961.

[3] Commentator's article in *Izvestia*, November 5, 1964.

pletely against their fallacy. The aggressive and warlike nature of U.S. imperialism has not changed in the least.

WHAT DOES THE "JOHNSON DOCTRINE" MEAN?

The Johnson Administration has inherited its predecessors' counter-revolutionary "global strategy", which aims at destroying the socialist countries, occupying the extensive first intermediate zone which embraces Asia, Africa and Latin America and dominating the capitalist countries in the second intermediate zone which covers Western Europe, North America, Oceania and Japan. In applying its counter-revolutionary dual tactics, the Johnson Administration has shown even greater adventurism, more reliance on wars of aggression and a stronger tendency to ignore its allies and go it alone recklessly. Here one sees the image of a highway robber.

Towards the socialist countries, the Johnson Administration adopts the cunning tactic of treating each one of them differently. It openly clamours that the United States must strive to induce forces within the Soviet Union to effect a change in order to restore the capitalist system there; and that the United States "must hasten the slow erosion of the Iron Curtain" in order to sever the Eastern European countries from the socialist camp. It also calls on the Soviet Union not to support the national liberation movements and makes this a condition for the maintenance of "peace". All this shows that, while keeping up powerful military pressure and preparing for war of aggression, the Johnson Administration is trying to disintegrate the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in Eastern Europe by peaceful means. At the same time, Johnson has also blatantly declared, "In Asia, communism wears a more aggressive face" and that it is

necessary to deal with "Communist aggression". This shows that the Johnson Administration has been trying to mainly threaten the Asian socialist countries with war and is actually perpetrating grave military provocations against them.

In Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Johnson Administration is brutally suppressing the national liberation movements and carrying out direct armed intervention everywhere. By increasingly broadening its aggression in south Viet Nam, massacring the people of the Congo (L) and sending troops to suppress the Dominican patriotic uprising, the Johnson Administration has launched wars of aggression in the countries of these three continents. It intensifies its aggression, intervention and infiltration into the national independent countries. It supports "Malaysia", a product of neo-colonialism, thus menacing Indonesia. It has directed the Thai and south Vietnamese puppet cliques to carry out frequent acts of armed provocation against Cambodia and conducted a series of subversive activities against Tanzania, the Congo (B), Burundi and other African countries. Collaborating with West Germany, the Johnson Administration supports Israel, provoking and threatening the Arab countries. In Brazil it plotted a reactionary military coup d'etat. All this demonstrates that the Johnson Administration has always tried to strangle the national liberation movements and the national independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America through war adventures and subversive manoeuvres, and has committed many evil deeds which its predecessors were afraid to commit.

The emergence of the notorious "Johnson doctrine" is another big exposure of the aggressive nature of U.S.

imperialism. In May this year, Johnson made the bellicose remark, when the United States was dispatching troops to the Dominican Republic, that "the American nations [should read U.S. imperialism] cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another communist government in the western hemisphere". He also said that in Viet Nam or anywhere else in the world where the United States has "commitments", "our power is essential, in the final test". Thus, Johnson has publicly announced to the whole world a political programme which aims at strangling the independence and freedom of all countries and suppressing the peoples' revolutionary movements by means of wars of aggression.

The "Johnson doctrine" is more adventurist and frenzied than all other "doctrines" proclaimed by previous U.S. administrations since the end of World War II. The Kennedy Administration, while stepping up arms expansion and war preparations, pursued a "strategy of peace" and, taking advantage of the adverse current of modern revisionism, carried on peaceful infiltration into certain socialist countries. It also started "operation kinship" in Asia, Africa and Latin America, sent out the "peace corps", rigged up "the alliance for progress" and sailed full speed ahead with its neo-colonialist policy. However, the accelerated development of the peoples' revolutionary movements all over the world shattered Kennedy's "strategy of peace". When Johnson assumed office he found that "peace", "democracy", "progress" and other tricks no longer worked. So he flagrantly ran up his black pirate pennant. The *New York Times* stated that the "Johnson doctrine" meant "resisting the advance of communism anywhere in the world with military forces". To launch aggression and war under the pretence

of anti-communism, to label all the peoples' struggles for independence and freedom as a "communist threat" — these were the old tricks of Hitler. Drew Pearson, an American columnist, admitted that the United States has been regarded as a "Hitler-like aggressor". The facts have proved that the "Johnson doctrine" is neo-Hitlerism.

In military strategy, the Johnson Administration has put forward the theory of "escalation". Drawing bitter lessons from the Korean war, Eisenhower dared not engage the socialist countries in direct ground warfare but advanced the strategy of "massive retaliation", attempting to use strategic nuclear weapons as a "deterrent", and "to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing". However, the great victories of the people's revolutions in Indo-China, Cuba, Algeria and other countries revealed the bankruptcy of this strategy. Kennedy had to admit that "overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war". The Kennedy Administration, therefore, adopted the strategy of "flexible response", preparing to fight nuclear war as well as limited and "special" wars. It laid emphasis on the use of "special wars" to suppress the national liberation movements and south Viet Nam became a proving ground for this "special war". But it was exactly in south Viet Nam that the "special war" met with ignominious failure. So on the basis of the strategy of "flexible response", Johnson has begun the "escalation", dividing the "special war", limited war and nuclear war into many stages and gradually intensifying his war adventures.

The Johnson Administration's "escalation" boils down to this: take a step and then decide what to do next; it is like committing murder and arson while in a constant

dread of being punished. As soon as the Korean war was over in 1954, Eisenhower said, "If the United States were, unilaterally, to permit its forces to be drawn into conflict in Indo-China and in a succession of Asian wars, the end result would be to drain off our resources and to weaken our over-all defensive position". Today, the U.S. generals and officials are still frightened to death when a war of the Korean type is mentioned. In the Korean war, the United States suffered 400,000 casualties, was driven back to where it first started the aggression and experienced an ignominious defeat. If the United States now intensifies its war adventures, it will invite bigger defeats. Nevertheless, Johnson cannot avoid going straight towards the abyss. All this gives the lie to the Khrushchov revisionists who disseminate the fallacy that the imperialists will foresee their own defeat and will therefore not start a war.

The theory and practice of the "Johnson doctrine" is a manifestation of the struggle of U.S. imperialism in its death throes. Dictated by their class instincts, all imperialists and reactionaries invariably dig their own graves by widening their wars of aggression. Wilhelm II courted his own disaster by unleashing World War I; Hitler met his doom by starting World War II; Japanese imperialism collapsed as a result of its aggression against China and the war it started in the Pacific. Now U.S. imperialism is traversing the same path, and it will never become any more "sensible" by virtue of its failures.

The reactionary, aggressive and adventurist character of the Johnson Administration is so obvious that one can hardly whitewash it. At times the Khrushchov revisionists have no alternative but to describe U.S. imperialism as being "the aggressor", "the international gendarme"

and "the main force of war and aggression of the present day". In doing this they are merely making a show of attacking U.S. imperialism, and then only to the extent that it does not affect "Soviet-U.S. co-operation". After the Johnson Administration brought the scourge of war to Viet Nam, they treat the matter lightly and evasively, say that this only shows the U.S. "ship of the state" tilts towards the "madmen" and that "today it would be unfounded to start from the supposition that the political front in the main Western countries, including the U.S.A., must inevitably move sharply to the Right in the near future".[1]

What nonsense! After all who are the madmen and who are the "sensible" ones in the U.S. ruling clique? The Khrushchov revisionists once said that Johnson was "moderate" while Goldwater was a madman, and now they say that Johnson has accepted Goldwater's policy and tilts towards the madmen. What is the difference between the two? They say it is wrong to predict that U.S. politics is turning to the Right, but is Johnson not Right enough, or is he "Left"? They said one thing yesterday and say something else today, all illogical and self-contradictory. Whatever they say, their sole aim is to absolve U.S. imperialism and clutch a straw to save their line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation" from drowning.

The Khrushchov revisionists assert that the nature of U.S. imperialism has changed. This precisely reflects their own class character. They have substituted the bourgeois theory of human nature for class analysis, and bourgeois pragmatism for Marxism-Leninism. According to their philosophy, "deep in the depths of the most

---

[1] "Foreign Policy and the Modern World", editorial board article in *Kommunist*, Moscow, No. 3, 1965.

dangerous murderer there broods something human",[1] and the virtue of kind-heartedness exists even in the most brutal U.S. imperialism. To them, revolutionary movement and class struggle are entirely unnecessary, and the destiny of the peoples, the destiny of mankind as a whole, may well depend on the kind-heartedness of U.S. imperialism. It is quite clear that without completely smashing and liquidating these revisionist fallacies, it is impossible for the peoples to wage a relentless and effective struggle against U.S. imperialism.

HOW TO ESTIMATE THE STRENGTH OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

The aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism never changes and its strategy for the subjugation of the people of the world has already been mapped out. Like a ferocious beast of prey, it will attack and devour people whether they provoke it or not. Either kill it or be devoured by it, there is no other alternative. A showdown between the peoples of the world and U.S. imperialism is inevitable, and the following questions are now posed before them: How shall we estimate the strength of U.S. imperialism? Can we defeat it?

SEE THROUGH THE APPEARANCE TO PERCEIVE THE ESSENCE

As early as 1946 Comrade Mao Tse-tung put forward the famous thesis that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers. He said:

---

[1] "Guilt and Punishment", *Literaturnaya Gazeta,* Moscow, May 13, 1965.

All reactionaries are paper tigers. In appearance, the reactionaries are terrifying, but in reality they are not so powerful. From a long-term point of view, it is not the reactionaries but the people who are really powerful.[1]

Two years after the victory of the October Revolution Lenin said:

> It seemed at that time that world imperialism was such a tremendous and invincible force that it was stupid of the workers of a backward country to attempt an uprising against it. Now, however, as we glance back over the past two years, we see that even our opponents are increasingly admitting that we are right. We see that imperialism, which seemed such an insuperable colossus, has proved before the whole world to be a colossus with feet of clay.[2]

The Marxist-Leninist thesis that imperialism is a colossus with feet of clay and a paper tiger reveals the essence of the question by seeing through the appearance. The people are the motive force that make history, while imperialism and all reactionaries are decadent forces of reaction completely divorced from the people. However strong they may appear to be, that is a transient manifestation. Only when we view U.S. imperialism in a matter-of-fact way and see its essence as a paper tiger, can we be bold enough to struggle against it and win victory. To exaggerate the strength of U.S. imperialism

---

[1] Mao Tse-tung, "Talk with the American Correspondent Anna Louise Strong", *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., FLP, Peking, 1961, Vol. IV, p. 100.

[2] V. I. Lenin, "Two Years of Soviet Rule", *Articles and Speeches on Anniversaries of the October Revolution*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1957, p. 38.

and belittle the strength of the masses will only encourage U.S. imperialism in its aggression and shatter the revolutionary fighting spirit of the peoples.

Khrushchov and his successors, the self-styled "Marxist-Leninists", are awe-struck in the presence of U.S. imperialism. They vociferously attack Comrade Mao Tse-tung's thesis that imperialism is a paper tiger and distort Lenin's famous axiom that imperialism is a colossus with feet of clay. They stress that U.S. imperialism is a paper tiger with "atomic teeth" and that it is a colossus, although "it is losing its positions". They proclaim that U.S. imperialism "is still strong and the struggle with it will be serious". They maintain that missiles, atomic and hydrogen bombs are the factors that decide the outcome of a war and that the people's armed force is nothing but "a heap of flesh". By inflating the arrogance of U.S. imperialism in this manner and spreading pessimism among the people of the world, they have no other purpose in mind than to make the people believe that U.S. imperialism is invincible and that the revolution of the peoples is hopeless.

A BIG WORM-EATEN HOLLOW TREE

U.S. imperialism is essentially weak, although it looks quite strong. The great victory of the Chinese people's revolution and the great victories of the revolutions of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples after World War II all confirm Comrade Mao Tse-tung's scientific thesis that imperialism and all reactionaries are paper tigers. So long as the people are united and defy the difficulties and fight resolutely without fear of making sacrifices, they are fully capable of defeating U.S. imperialism.

In the spirit of "rather die than be enslaved", the south Vietnamese people are heroically resisting U.S. imperialist aggression. Without an air force or a navy they have routed hundreds of thousands of puppet troops equipped by U.S. imperialism with up-to-date weapons, defeated its "special war" and are now victoriously resisting the U.S. aggressive forces. The more troops the United States pours into south Viet Nam, the worse will be its defeat. American soldiers are panic-stricken when they are sent to the front. American air bases have been attacked one after another and the American embassy staff at Saigon spend their days in terror. The Americans have admitted that they cannot conquer the south Vietnamese people even with half a million troops.

The Dominican Republic with its three million population is located on an island close to the doorstep of the United States. When its people rose in revolt, Johnson trembled in his shoes and within a couple of days dispatched more than thirty thousand aggressive troops there in an attempt to quickly suppress the anti-U.S. patriotic struggle. But the Dominican people are not scared by U.S. imperialism and have put up a resolute resistance. The struggle at Santo Domingo has continued for three months and is now spreading to the hinterlands. Finding itself on the horns of a dilemma, the Johnson Administration has fallen into another quagmire.

There is an irreconcilable contradiction between U.S. imperialism's insatiable appetite for aggression and its limited daily diminishing strength. It has over-reached itself, and it is beaten wherever it commits aggression. Its predicament is just like that of the Family of Lord Jung described by Leng Tzu-hsing in the famous classical Chinese novel, *The Dream of the Red Chamber*,

"Although the structure is not yet breaking down, there is a lot of trouble inside." The United States has only 2,700,000 troops of which more than a million are scattered throughout the world, and it can hardly cope with the emergencies all at once. It is already conscious of an acute shortage of manpower in its wars of aggression in south Viet Nam and the Dominican Republic and is trying to recruit more servicemen from among the American young men who are not at all keen to serve as cannon-fodder. How can the United States possibly meet the situation if there are fronts other than those in south Viet Nam and the Dominican Republic? Walter Lippmann, the well-known bourgeois commentator, asked in dismay, "how many Viet Nams and Dominican Republics can the marines police at one and the same time?"

The Johnson Administration's policies of war and aggression are extremely unpopular in the United States. American workers, farmers, intellectuals and other people have launched a gigantic protest movement against the war of aggression in Viet Nam. They have held meetings, staged demonstrations and issued declarations. A hundred thousand college and university students and teachers have taken part in teach-ins condemning the Johnson Administration. Greatly alarmed, the White House hurriedly sent its senior officials everywhere to "explain", in a drastic effort to calm down the indignation of the broad masses of the people. Rusk, Bundy and their company were hissed and booed wherever they went and were stumped by questions put to them by the audiences. Such an extensive political mass movement has seldom hitherto been seen in America and is unprecedented since the end of World War II. It is a manifestation of the new awakening of the American people.

U.S. economy is riddled with difficulties. The militarization of the national economy has had serious repercussions: a huge surplus of productive capacity, a daily shrinking consumers' market and over ten million people in the army of the jobless. The much-vaunted richest country in the world is head over heels in debt, with public and private debts totalling over 1,300,000 million U.S. dollars. The balance of international payments is extremely unfavourable. The position of the American dollar, long regarded as an all-powerful instrument of aggression, is unstable and that of the American monetary and financial system is critical. W. M. Martin, Chairman of the American Federal Reserve Board, noted with surprise that there are "disquieting similarities in the present economic situation to conditions in the pre-Depression 1920s".

For quite a long time since World War II the United States had been a "benefactor" to other capitalist countries. It had tightened its grip on its allies in all spheres and trampled them underfoot. Tremendous changes have now occurred in the balance of forces in the capitalist world, and the Western European countries, in opposition to U.S. domination, are seriously challenging its hegemony. The contradiction between France and the United States has developed into an antagonism on a global scale. Irreconcilable contradictions also exist between the United States and other major capitalist countries such as Britain, West Germany, Japan and Canada. The aggressive military blocs which the United States has taken great pains to rig up are disintegrating one after another. Although the Johnson Administration has put great pressure on its allies and vassal states, urging them to send troops to south Viet Nam to boost

the morale there and salvage the fiasco, it has only succeeded in getting a handful of men from a few countries while many others simply ignored the request. One American newsman sadly remarked, ". . . we can search the globe and look in vain for true and active supporters of our policy."

U.S. imperialism is like a big worm-eaten hollow tree. The onslaught of world revolutionary storms has shaken it to its very foundation, and it is faring worse and worse. Johnson is like an ant on a hot pan, bustling about almost round the clock. One American newsman said that before he was elected president, Johnson was a well-disposed man, but now he has become terribly bad-tempered and detests criticism and will not listen to advice. There is an air of commotion around the White House, and whenever Johnson has planned a military adventure he can't go to sleep. The tired and troubled president settles into bed at one o'clock in the morning and at three wakes up again. He has confessed that his greatest dread is the urgent ring of the telephone, for he is seldom awakened to hear good news. He loses his balance easily and is ill at ease. When he comes to deal with problems he is confused. Dispirited, he has been known to slip out of the back door of the White House and go boating on a gloomy river.

How alike is the panic-stricken and hysterical Johnson to Hitler in his last days!

AN INCURABLE SPINELESSNESS

Under the impact of the furious anti-U.S. movement all over the world, the days of U.S. imperialism are numbered. It is U.S. imperialism which is afraid of the peo-

ple of the world, and not vice versa — this is a characteristic of the present international situation.

Like everything else in the world, U.S. imperialism has two aspects to its character. Strategically, in regard to its very nature, it is nothing but a paper tiger and has not much strength. But tactically, in regard to each specific struggle, U.S. imperialism must be recognized as a real tiger, as a man-eater. Hasn't it eaten and isn't it still eating thousands upon thousands of people in south Viet Nam, the Congo (L) and the Dominican Republic? Therefore, strategically we should despise U.S. imperialism but tactically we should take it into full account. By despising it strategically we shall have the courage to fight it and by taking full account of it tactically we shall know how to fight it.

The Khrushchov revisionists only see the outward semblance of strength of U.S. imperialism but not its inherent weakness; they only see the real tiger but not the paper tiger in U.S. imperialism. They even dismiss this dialectical viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism as "double-dealing". This only testifies to their complete ignorance of Marxism-Leninism.

According to Khrushchov revisionism, one is just one and two just two, the strong are just the strong and the weak just the weak. Strength contains no weakness and weakness no strength; there is no transformation of the strong into the weak and vice versa. In their eyes, U.S. imperialism is always strong and the people always weak. According to Marxism-Leninism, everything transforms itself into its opposite under given conditions: the strong is transformed into the weak and the weak into the strong. Lenin said, "If you want a revolution . . .

you must be strong."[1] This means that all new-born revolutionary forces are small and weak at the beginning but will eventually become big and strong, therefore they are definitely the strong. All imperialist and reactionary forces, however big and strong they may be at the beginning, will eventually become small and weak, therefore they are definitely the weak. Stalin also said:

> That which in life is born and grows day by day is invincible, its progress cannot be checked . . . no matter how weak and small in numbers it may be *today*, in the long run it must triumph. . . . On the other hand, that which in life is growing old and advancing to its grave must inevitably suffer defeat . . . no matter how strong and numerous it may be today, it must, in the long run, suffer defeat.[2]

Such transformations from strong to weak, big to small, a rise to a fall, and vice versa, constitute the whole history of the class struggle in human society. None but the blind would fail to see these facts. It goes without saying that transformation presupposes the existence of given conditions. The revolutionary struggle of the people of all countries is no plain sailing, nor is the road ahead of them straight. They may meet with difficulties and obstacles now and then and may even suffer temporary but enormous sacrifices. In these circumstances what is essential is courage in struggle and the spirit to make sacrifices. Once imbued with this revolutionary

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "No Falsehood! Our Strength Lies in Stating Truth!" *Collected Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1962, Vol. IX, p. 298.

[2] J. V. Stalin, "Anarchism or Socialism?" *Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1954, Vol. I, p. 301.

spirit, they will find that despite "the narrow path, the deep woods, the slippery moss. . . . The wind will unfurl like a scroll our scarlet banner."[1]

In his short story "Chen Peng-nien Exorcises the Ghost by Breath" Yuan Mei of the Ching Dynasty describes how the ghost of the man who has died by hanging himself stands erect and blows at Chen with a breath like icy wind. Chen's hair stands on end and his teeth chatter while his lamp fades into a pale light. "The ghost has breath," ponders Chen nevertheless. "That I have too, haven't I?" So in return he blows hard at the ghost till it dissolves into a wisp of smoke. The story demonstrates that if man does not fear the ghost, the ghost will fear man. U.S. imperialism is a ghost, good only at scaring people. If you are frightened by it, it will do much harm. If you are not frightened but return blow for blow, then the ghost's game will soon be up.

The Khrushchov revisionists have been cowed by the U.S. imperialists' war blackmail and have succumbed to its pressure. They are afflicted with an incurable spinelessness. They are scared of revolution, shirk sacrifice, dare not engage in a tit-for-tat struggle against U.S. imperialism and even oppose the revolutionary cause of the people of all countries. They go out of their way to publicize the terrors of war and counterpose world revolution against the cause of world peace. They have gone so far as to clamour that there are certain people who assert that "the world revolution is more important than the preservation of peace. But . . . which is more

---

[1] Quoted from Mao Tse-tung's poem "New Year's Day" written in 1930.

important, the head or the body?"[1] They even betray the revolution in the pursuit of peace. To them, rather slavery than death and not the reverse. This is the renegade philosophy of the Khrushchov revisionists.

Lenin said:

> . . . He who does not know how to distinguish sacrifices which are suffered in the course of the revolutionary struggle for the sake of its victory, when all the property-owning, all the counter-revolutionary classes are fighting against the revolution, he who does not know how to distinguish these sacrifices from the 'sacrifices of a plundering, exploiting war — is a representative of the most extreme backwardness and we must say of him: We must set him to study the A B C and before we give him extra-tutorial education we should give him elementary school education, or else this man is a representative of the most vicious, Kolchakian hypocrisy, whatever he calls himself, under whatever name he hides himself.[2]

Isn't this a portrait of the Khrushchov revisionists?

HOW TO DEAL WITH U.S. IMPERIALISM?

Who are our enemies? Who are our friends? With whom should we unite and whom should we oppose? This is a question of the first importance for the revolution. To ensure success for all revolutionary strug-

---

[1] "The Realism of the Revolutionary", *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, April 22, 1965.

[2] V. I. Lenin, *The Deception of the People by the Slogans of Equality and Freedom*, Eng. ed., Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1942, p. 14.

gles, it is necessary to unite with real friends in order to oppose real enemies.

Today U.S. imperialism is the main force of war and aggression and the arch enemy of the people of the whole world. In order to round up bandits, one must catch their ringleader first. The primary task of all Marxist-Leninists and all revolutionaries is to unite the people throughout the world and direct the spearhead of struggle at U.S. imperialism. The Khrushchov revisionists, however, have completely reversed the enemy-friend relationship. They look upon U.S. imperialism as their bosom friend and the revolutionary people of the whole world as their enemies. This cannot but lead to a sharp struggle between the two lines on the question of how to deal with U.S. imperialism.

HOLD ALOFT THE VICTORIOUS BANNER OF THE ANTI-U.S. UNITED FRONT

Proceeding from the actual world situation as a whole and from a class analysis of the fundamental contradictions in the contemporary world, and directing its attention to the counter-revolutionary "global strategy" of U.S. imperialism, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has pointed out in "A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement", that the international proletariat must and can unite all the forces that can be united, make use of the internal contradictions in the enemy camp, and form a broad united front against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. This is a line of boldly arousing the masses, expanding the revolutionary forces, winning over the middle forces and isolating U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

Comrade Mao Tse-tung has, during the last few years, published a number of statements and talks in support of the just struggle of the people in all countries against U.S. imperialism. The fundamental concept in these statements and talks is that the people of the whole world should unite to defeat the U.S. aggressor and all its lackeys. Comrade Mao Tse-tung calls on the people in the socialist camp, the people of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the people of all continents in the world, all peace-loving countries and all countries subjected to U.S. aggression, control, interference and bullying, to unite and form the broadest united front in opposing the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war and safeguarding world peace.

The international situation is developing exactly along this line. With every passing day the political consciousness of the people throughout the world is rising, the struggle against U.S. imperialism is mounting and the anti-U.S. united front is expanding. The people of the socialist countries and the oppressed peoples and nations are carrying on their struggle on the same front. The struggle of the people in all countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America against new and old colonialism headed by U.S. imperialism is forging ahead with the power of a thunderbolt and the people in more and more countries have taken up arms and are conducting a most courageous fight against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys. There have also been new developments in the struggle of the people of the countries in Western Europe, North America and Oceania against the U.S. imperialist policies of aggression and war. Today, an ever-increasing number of people are joining the ranks of the world-wide anti-U.S. united front. U.S. imperialism is

being besieged, circle upon circle, by the people of the whole world.

A COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY BLACK THREAD

The Khrushchov revisionists are blind to the strength of the world's revolutionary people and regard U.S. imperialism as all-powerful, believing that every question in the world must be solved by their co-operation with the United States. Khrushchov was like this and so are his successors. A counter-revolutionary black thread of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination" runs through their whole set of revisionist policies, be they "peaceful co-existence", "peaceful transition" or "peaceful competition".

The shaping and growth of this revisionist line is not a chance phenomenon but has deep-set social class origins. Internally, it is the consequence of the unbridled growth of the capitalist forces in the Soviet Union. Externally, it is the product of the imperialists' counter-revolutionary dual tactics of threats and blandishments. The Khrushchov revisionist clique is the political representative of the privileged bourgeois stratum newly emerged in the Soviet Union. They place the interests of the privileged few above the interests of the people of the Soviet Union, the people of the socialist countries and the people of the whole world. While no longer making revolution themselves, they are afraid that their sweet dreams of bourgeois life may be shattered by the revolutions of other peoples. They substitute bourgeois national egoism and great-power chauvinism for proletarian internationalism, split the socialist camp and the international communist movement,

compromise the revolutionary cause of the oppressed peoples and nations and capitulate to U.S. imperialism.

Do the people of the various countries want to survive? If so, they should rely only upon "Soviet-U.S. co-operation". Never make any revolution; otherwise, "it needs only a single spark to cause disaster"[1] and "any international conflict can grow into the conflagration of a world war".[2]

Do the oppressed nations want independence? If so, they had better wait until the United Nations comes to arrange matters for them. "Who, if not the United Nations Organization, should champion the abolition of the colonial system of government?"[3]

Are the people of the various countries very poor? If so, please wait for the "complete disarmament" of the Soviet Union and the United States. If a mere 8-10 per cent of the total amount of money spent for military purposes throughout the world were set aside, "it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within twenty years."[4]

Do the national independent countries want to develop their own national economy? If so, they have to look to the Soviet Union and the United States for economic "aid". It is said that, in their economic development, the liberated countries "will have to satisfy a considerable part of their needs through the imperialist states", and

---

[1] N. S. Khrushchov, "Letter to Bertrand Russell", *On Peaceful Co-existence*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1961, p. 7.

[2] N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at a Reception for Prince Norodom Sihanouk, *Pravda*, December 2, 1960.

[3] N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the U.N. General Assembly, September 23, 1960.

[4] N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, July 10, 1962.

as the Soviet Union takes a hand in the matter, these countries "now have the possibility of acting as an independent and equal party"[1] when they accept the American aid.

Are the people in the various countries in fear of aggression? If so, they had better bow down before Soviet nuclear weapons! "The Soviet Union's rocket and nuclear might is the decisive factor in the maintenance of peace."[2]

Do the people of the various countries aspire towards socialism? If so, they had better wait till the day when Soviet-U.S. "peaceful competition" will lay a golden egg! Once the Soviet Union becomes the most powerful country in the world, "the people of all countries will be eventually convinced of socialism" and "the peaceful road" of the socialist revolution "will become more possible than before".[3]

To put it in a nutshell, once the Soviet Union and the United States clasp hands, a new era in international relations will begin, the tense situation will tend to relax, and the people of all countries will enjoy peace, independence, freedom and a happy life. Why can "Soviet-U.S. co-operation" work such wonders? The Khrushchov revisionists have already made that clear:

> Each of these two powers [the Soviet Union and the United States] is leading a large group of nations

---

[1] V. Tyagunenko, "Urgent Questions of the Non-Capitalist Road of Development", *World Economics and International Relations*, published by *Pravda*, No. 11, 1964.

[2] N. S. Khrushchov, Speech at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, July 10, 1962.

[3] A. Shapiro, "Economic Competition of Two Systems — the Most Important Battleground of Class Struggle on the International Arena", *Economic Questions*, Moscow, No. 1, 1965.

— the Soviet Union leading the world socialist system and the United States leading the capitalist camp.[1]

The Soviet Union and the United States "are the strongest countries in the world and if we unite for peace there can be no war. Then if any madman wanted war, we would but have to shake our fingers to warn him off."[2] If there is agreement between the government heads of the Soviet Union and the United States, "there will be a solution of international problems on which mankind's destinies depend".[3]

Just see how high and mighty is the idea of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination"! It seems that the overlords only have to shake their little fingers and the people throughout the world will have to submit to their will, allow themselves to be butchered and the whole world, large as it is, will be held in the palms of their hands. Is this not typical great-power chauvinism and power politics?

POLICIES CATERING TO U.S. IMPERIALISM

The whole set of policies of the Khrushchov revisionists completely caters to the needs of U.S. imperialism. Their words and deeds are little different from those of the U.S. imperialists. U.S. imperialism forbids the people to make revolution, so do the Khrushchov revisionists.

---

[1] N. N. Yakovlev, "After Thirty Years . . .", a pamphlet written for the 30th anniversary of Soviet-American diplomatic relations.

[2] N. S. Khrushchov, Interview with the U.S. Correspondent C. L. Sulzberger on September 5, 1961, *Pravda,* September 10, 1961.

[3] A. A. Gromyko, Speech at the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, December 13, 1962.

U.S. imperialism wants to make use of the United Nations, so the Khrushchov revisionists laud it to the skies. U.S. imperialism seeks to benumb the people with the lie of disarmament so that it can go all out for war preparation, so the Khrushchov revisionists proclaim general and complete disarmament as an immense service to mankind. U.S. imperialism seeks to push through its neo-colonialism under the guise of "aid", so the Khrushchov revisionists try to have a share in this business. U.S. imperialism seeks to induce the oppressed nations to effect a "peaceful change", so the Khrushchov revisionists follow suit, demanding that all the oppressed nations and peoples take the road of "peaceful transition" while enforcing a "peaceful evolution" towards capitalism in their own country. Why is it that the words and deeds of the Khrushchov revisionists and the U.S. imperialists are so very much alike that there is no difference whatever between them? What else can account for this similarity if not the fact that they are in collusion with each other? No wonder the Khrushchov revisionists' line of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination" is only appreciated by U.S. imperialism and its lackeys while it is condemned by the people throughout the world.

Kennedy said, ". . . we need a much better weapon than the H-bomb — a weapon better than ballistic missiles or nuclear submarines — and that better weapon is peaceful co-operation." And the Western press has said, "Comrade Khrushchev is considered, as far as the free world is concerned, the best Prime Minister the Russians have. He genuinely believes in peaceful coexistence." Recently, when U.S. imperialism was stepping up its aggression against Viet Nam, Johnson said:

> The common interests of the peoples of Russia and the United States are many — and this I would say to the people of the Soviet Union: there is no American interest in conflict with the Soviet people anywhere. And no true Soviet interest is served by the support of aggression or subversion anywhere.

That is to say, the United States has many "common interests" with the Khrushchov revisionists and is willing to "co-operate" with them, so long as they do not support the revolutionary struggle of the people of Viet Nam and those of other peoples, so long as they accept America's conditions on "peace". Like Khrushchov, the Khrushchov revisionists of today are also at the beck and call of U.S. imperialism.

BETRAYAL BEHIND THE FACADE OF SUPPORT

When we say that the Khrushchov revisionists and Khrushchov are as alike as two peas, they may raise objections. Haven't they frequently called for opposition to U.S. imperialism and support for the national liberation movements and the fraternal socialist countries? Is this not somewhat different from Khrushchov? In fact, they talk in one way and act in quite another. What Marxist-Leninists would like to hear are facts, not empty words aimed to deceive the people. Only facts convince people while empty words cannot deceive them for long. Let us then examine the facts.

The Khrushchov revisionists now profess that they oppose U.S. imperialism, but in actual deeds, they swear time and again to the U.S. government that they will continue to pursue the policy of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation".

They profess support for the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but in actual deeds, they undermine them. In co-ordination with the U.S.-devised plot of "national reconciliation", they continue to disrupt the national liberation movement in the Congo (L). They work hand in glove with U.S. imperialism to plot the establishment of a permanent U.N. armed force to suppress the revolutions of the peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America. They recently offered five million U.S. dollars to the United Nations in the name of "advance payments for the budget".

They profess support for the fraternal socialist countries, but in actual deeds, continue to betray their interests. They assert time and again that the status quo in the German problem is "fairly satisfactory and it should not be changed", pigeonholing the question of an early conclusion of the German peace treaty and the settlement of the West Berlin question. They made no powerful counter-attack when the West German militarists held a session of the Bundestag in West Berlin, an act of serious provocation to the Democratic Republic of Germany and the socialist camp.

Their double-faced trickery is now particularly conspicuous on the Viet Nam question. They raise one hand to pledge their support to the Vietnamese people and raise the other to bloodily suppress the students from Viet Nam and other countries, studying in the Soviet Union, for staging anti-U.S. demonstrations in Moscow and Leningrad. On some occasions they make the gesture of demanding the withdrawal of U.S. troops from south Viet Nam, while at other times they keep complete silence on the matter. On the one hand they make some moves in giving aid to Viet Nam, while on the other, they divulge

in advance to the United States particulars about the aid. They profess opposition to U.S. imperialist aggression against Viet Nam but at the same time embrace and sing in chorus with such faithful lackeys and precious pets of U.S. imperialism as Tito and Shastri, trumpeting "peace talks" so as to find a way out for U.S. imperialism.

If one makes only a little analysis of these contradictory phenomena, proceeding from the surface to what lies behind, and discriminating between true and false, one can easily see that their purpose in flaunting the banner of "support Viet Nam" and worming their way into the ranks of the people of the world who support the Vietnamese people's anti-U.S. patriotic struggle, is to make political capital out of it in order to strike more bargains with the United States and betray the Vietnamese people's revolutionary cause. This is the betrayal behind the facade of support.

Just as the Khrushchov revisionists raise their voices shouting support for Viet Nam, the U.S. imperialists affirm that the Khrushchov revisionists are "itching" to resume the "peaceful coexistence dialogue" with the United States and there is "evidence of an almost frantic search by the Soviet Government for ways of insulating Russian-American relations from any further damage caused by the war in Vietnam." These words afford much food for thought.

Aren't the Khrushchov revisionists with their treacherous way of doing things the living image of the "double-faced man" in the classical Chinese novel *Flowers in the Mirror*? The "double-faced man" sometimes puts on his hood and acts the role of a gentleman, and at other times he takes it off and reveals the ferocious features of an

ogre. He has two faces, each serving one purpose. What the Khrushchov revisionists call support and aid to Viet Nam are meant to deceive the people; their real aim is to bring the Viet Nam question into the orbit of "Soviet-U.S. co-operation for world domination" and suppress the Vietnamese people's struggle against U.S. aggression.

CURSES COME HOME TO ROOST

Times have changed; the days in which a few big powers could decide the destiny of other countries are gone for ever. The Khrushchov revisionists think that the Soviet Union and the United States can shut out the heavens with one palm and dominate the world. This is diametrically opposed to the trend of the times and will never work.

There are more than 130 countries and over 3,000 million people in the world. More than 90 per cent of the world's population want revolution. Where there is aggression and oppression there is bound to be struggle for freedom and liberation. The revolutionary cause of the people of the world is a mighty historical tide which no force can stem. The U.S. imperialists are only a handful of people and so are the Khrushchov revisionists. The fact that they stand opposite to the peoples of the world, including the great Soviet people, and oppose revolution, only shows how badly they have overrated themselves. "Ants infesting the locust tree assume a great nation swagger, and silly gnats lightly conspire to fell the giant tree."[1] How can a few flies dashing against the wall reverse heaven and earth?

---

[1] Quoted from Mao Tse-tung's poem "Reply to Comrade Kuo Mo-jo", written on January 9, 1963.

All Marxist-Leninists uphold the principle, persevere in revolution, resolutely fight against U.S. imperialism and are firm in exposing and criticizing Khrushchov revisionism. The people of the socialist countries are determined to carry the revolution through to the end. The Khrushchov revisionists cannot resolve their contradictions with the people in their own country, still less can they dominate all the socialist countries.

The people of Asia, Africa and Latin America want to decide their own destiny and carry the national democratic revolution through to the end. How can the Khrushchov revisionists stop them? The people of Asia, Africa and Latin America are pushing on to the road of victory the wheel of revolution against imperialism, headed by the United States, and its lackeys. Can the Khrushchov revisionists turn the wheel backwards? Even if their schemes succeed in causing temporary setbacks to the people's revolutionary struggle in a certain locality, this can only serve to teach the people by negative example. For instance, in the Congo (L), they worked hand in glove with the U.S. imperialists and wrecked that country's national independence. But having learned the lesson which was paid for in blood, the Congolese people wiped off the blood, took up arms and went into victorious struggle again. This example will help the people see that to lead the national democratic revolution to greater victories, it is essential to reject and eliminate the control of the Khrushchov revisionism and its influence.

The new-emerging countries want to safeguard their national independence and smash the aggressive and subversive schemes of U.S. imperialism. How can the Khrushchov revisionists suppress them? To safeguard her "crown of independence", Indonesia has resolutely

withdrawn from the United Nations. Displeased as they are, can the Khrushchov revisionists do anything about it? To safeguard her sovereignty and national dignity, Cambodia has resolutely declared her severance of diplomatic relations with the United States. Displeased as they are, can the Khrushchov revisionists do anything about it?

Quite a number of capitalist countries are also resisting U.S. control. U.S. imperialism can no longer maintain its hegemony. What can the Khrushchov revisionists do to help the United States?

The "global strategy" of U.S. imperialism has always been to monopolize the world and prevent anyone from having a finger in its pie. The Khrushchov revisionists are like a forlorn lover, dreaming of joint domination of the world with the United States. How can the United States single them out for favours without harming them when it is prepared at any time to double-cross and ride roughshod over its allies and get rid of its lackeys when they have outlived their usefulness? By repeatedly capitulating to U.S. imperialism, all that they have received is humiliation and again humiliation. "While the drooping flowers pine for love, the heartless brook babbles on." And so the "joint domination" will end in nothing but the Khrushchov revisionists themselves being dominated by U.S. imperialism.

Here is one of Aesop's fables. A fox and his friend the ass met a lion. The fox tricked the ass into a deep pit, thinking that by sacrificing his friend, his own life would be safe. The lion, however, did not let the fox go. The fable tells people that those who betray their friends begin with an intention to harm others but they end up harming themselves.

THE TWO LINES ARE ABSOLUTELY IRRECONCILABLE

The question of how to deal with U.S. imperialism is a question of whether the two-thirds of the world's population still living under the imperialist-capitalist system need to make revolution and whether the remaining one-third already on the path of socialism need to carry their revolution through to the end. The question is one which affects the destiny of the whole of mankind. It is a touchstone for everyone in the world. Everyone must make a choice and thereby prove himself to be revolutionary, non-revolutionary or counter-revolutionary. It is on this momentous question that the Marxist-Leninists and the Khrushchov revisionists are pursuing two diametrically opposed lines.

The two different lines will inevitably lead to two entirely different results. Following the Marxist-Leninist line, the world revolutionary forces will steadily grow, their unity will constantly be strengthened, U.S. imperialism will be defeated and world peace preserved. Following the Khrushchov revisionist line, the world revolutionary forces will be weakened, the solidarity of the peoples undermined, the aggressive ambitions of U.S. imperialism fanned and world peace endangered. The two lines are as separate and distinct as two rivers divided by a watershed; they lead to two antipodal results. The peoples of the world must persist in the first line and strive to achieve the first result. They must oppose the second line and prevent the second result.

The Marxist-Leninists and revolutionary people all over the world have achieved great victories in their fight against Khrushchov revisionism. But the Khrushchov re-

visionists are not reconciled to their defeat and they will not hang up their axe until it is completely broken. By hypocritical and nefarious means, they continue to pursue their revisionist line and to unite with U.S. imperialism and its lackeys in opposing the revolutionary people of the whole world.

Lenin has rightly said, "A struggle against imperialism that is not closely linked up with the struggle against opportunism is an idle phrase, or a fraud."[1]

The cause of world revolution is, in the last analysis, the cause of millions upon millions. Only by constantly exposing the Khrushchov revisionists' betrayal of the interests of the masses and showing them up as the virtual agents of imperialism can the revolutionary awareness and fighting spirit of the masses be constantly enhanced. To combat Khrushchov revisionism resolutely is an indispensable condition for final victory in the struggle of the peoples of the world against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys.

The present world situation is becoming more and more favourable to Marxism-Leninism and to the revolutionary people of the world and more and more unfavourable to U.S. imperialism, the reactionaries of all countries and modern revisionism. U.S. imperialism is on its last legs and is reaching the end of its tether. The cause of world revolution, like the rising sun, is shining in all its splendour.

"Even if your bodies and names should perish, the flowing of the rivers will not thereby stop."[2] Whatever

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, "The War Program of the Proletarian Revolution", *Selected Works*, Eng. ed., FLPH, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 577.

[2] Quoted from Tu Fu, a poet of the Tang Dynasty.

service the Khrushchov revisionists may render to U.S. imperialism, they cannot save it from defeat and destruction. They will only bring ruin and shame upon themselves and be cursed by posterity.

Document generated by Anna’s Archive around 2023-2024 as part of the DuXiu collection (https://annas-blog.org/duxiu-exclusive.html).

Images have been losslessly embedded. Information about the original file can be found in PDF attachments. Some stats (more in the PDF attachments):

{
  "filename": "NDA0Mjc2OTcuemlw",
  "filename_decoded": "40427697.zip",
  "filesize": 2716569,
  "md5": "77072eebe711b94f8eb1293f6446f13c",
  "header_md5": "3ebfaa01ec396ac4961fd62b015c3a83",
  "sha1": "5e553c4495b8ceb7cc130ce629ff5f877df35222",
  "sha256": "565d057e5edc545ffde3544b33be50cd7436c8c6f174b8b5d19ecdd3bfa98f21",
  "crc32": 1669260838,
  "zip_password": "",
  "uncompressed_size": 2790825,
  "pdg_dir_name": "A Struggle between two lines over the question of how to deal with U S imperialism_40427697",
  "pdg_main_pages_found": 41,
  "pdg_main_pages_max": 41,
  "total_pages": 45,
  "total_pixels": 138564930,
  "pdf_generation_missing_pages": false
}